

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the above-identified application is requested.

The objection to the drawings is believed overcome by the amendment to the description.

Claims 2 and 4 were rejected as indefinite. The foregoing amendments to these claims is believed to obviate any perceived ambiguity.

Claims 1–9 and 17–19 were rejected as anticipated by Burrows ('631).

Claim 1 recites "an injection molded article." Claim 17 recites "an instrument cluster having at least one electroluminescent lamp as a first surface in a molded portion of the cluster." Claim 19 recites a "cellular telephone having an electroluminescent panel as a first surface of a molded portion of the telephone."

The Burrows patent does not use the words "injection" or "mold." There is no disclosure of an EL lamp molded into the surface of an article, instrument cluster, or telephone. How can there be anticipation?

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1–9 and 17–19 are in condition for allowance. A Notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul F. Wille
Reg. No. 25,274
Attorney for Applicants

Rogers Corporation – Durel Division
2225 West Chandler Boulevard
Chandler, AZ 85224
(602) 549–9088